

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 10/734,932 | 12/12/2003 | Chi Fai Ho | IPLN.P0001C | 2247 |
| 7 | 590 07/26/2006 | | EXAMINER HARRIS, CHANDA L | |
| Peter Tong 1807 Limetree | Tana | | | |
| Mountain View | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | • | | 3715 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--|--|
| | 10/734,932 | HO ET AL. |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Chanda L. Harris | 3715 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |
| Status | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 Ag</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E | action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro | |
| Disposition of Claims | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-32 are subject to restriction and/or expressions. | vn from consideration. | |
| Application Papers | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine | epted or b) objected to by the beddening(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | ion No ed in this National Stage |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | |

Application/Control Number: 10/734,932 Page 2

Art Unit: 3715

DETAILED ACTION

Note: Examiner regrets the delay in the issuance of this Election/Restriction requirement. However, Examiner asserts that this requirement is necessary for the reasons below.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 13-16 and 23-26, drawn to a computer-implemented method, classified in class 434, subclass 323.
- II. Claims 17-18 and 27-28, drawn to a computer-implemented method, classified in class 434, subclass 353.
- III. Claims 19-20, drawn to a computer-implemented method, classified in class 434, subclass 362.
- IV. Claims 21-22, drawn to a computer-implemented method, classified in class 434, subclass 236.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

1. Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as a computer-implemented method for helping a user learn a subject that does not require

Art Unit: 3715

at least retrieving, for a user to learn, materials in an area relating a third area and a fourth area of a subject, with the user previously being assessed to have achieved a certain level of understanding in both the third and the fourth areas, depending on the time elapsed from the time when the user has been assessed to have achieved a certain level of understanding in the third area. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Page 3

- 2. Inventions I and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as a computer-implemented method for helping a user learn a subject that does not require at least determining a reward for the user based on one or more conditions relating to the user learning the subject. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 3. Inventions I and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as a computer-implemented method for helping a user learn a subject that does not require at least determining, based on one or more conditions relating to the user learning the subject, whether to restrict the user from enjoying certain materials not for learning the subject. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 4. Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in

Art Unit: 3715

scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as a computer-implemented method for helping a user learn a subject that does not require at least determining a reward for the user based on one or more conditions relating to the user learning the subject. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Page 4

- 5. Inventions II and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination II has separate utility such as a computer-implemented method for helping a user learn a subject that does not require at least determining, based on one or more conditions relating to a user learning the subject, whether to restrict the user from enjoying certain materials not for learning the subject. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
- 6. Inventions III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination III has separate utility such as a computer-implemented method for helping a user learn a subject that does not require at least wherein the restricting is achieved by modifying at least one function of a device with respect to certain materials. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Art Unit: 3715

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper...

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Art Unit: 3715

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanda L. Harris whose telephone number is 571-272-4448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 571-272-6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3715

Chanda L. Harris Primary Examiner Page 7

Art Unit 3715